against defendants CULTURED GOURMET, LLC (herein after collectively defendant) as follows: CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT JURISDICTION 1. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338, allowing original jurisdiction in this court for patent cases. VENUE 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) in that defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.	1 2 3 4 5	Eric A. Klein									
ERIC A, KLEIN Plaintiff, vs. COMPLAINT FOR DESIGN PATENT INFRINGEMENT IJURY TRIAL DEMANDED CULTURED GOURMET, LLC Defendant. Plaintiff Eric A. Klein (KLEIN) alleges in this Complaint for patent infringement against defendants CULTURED GOURMET, LLC (herein after collectively defendant) as follows: CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT JURISDICTION 1. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338, allowing original jurisdiction in this court for patent cases. VENUE 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) in that defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.											
ERIC A, KLEIN Plaintiff, 11 vs. 12 13 14 Defendant. 15 16 Plaintiff Eric A. Klein (KLEIN) alleges in this Complaint for patent infringement against defendants CULTURED GOURMET, LLC (herein after collectively defendant) as follows: CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT JURISDICTION 1. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338, allowing original jurisdiction in this court for patent cases. VENUE 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) in that defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.	8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA									
Plaintiff Eric A. Klein (KLEIN) alleges in this Complaint for patent infringement against defendants CULTURED GOURMET, LLC (herein after collectively defendant) as follows: CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT JURISDICTION 1. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338, allowing original jurisdiction in this court for patent cases. VENUE 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) in that defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.	10 11 12 13 14	Plaintiff, vs. COMPLAINT FOR DESIGN PATENT INFRINGEMENT JURY TRIAL DEMANDED CULTURED GOURMET, LLC)									
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) in that defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.	17										
JURISDICTION 1. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338, allowing original jurisdiction in this court for patent cases. VENUE 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) in that defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.	19	CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT									
1. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338, allowing original jurisdiction in this court for patent cases. VENUE 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) in that defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.	20										
24 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § 1391(c) in that 25 defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have 26 transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.	22	 Jurisdiction is pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § 1338, allowing original jurisdiction in this court for patent cases. <u>VENUE</u> Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § 1391(c) in that 									
25 Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § 1391(c) in that defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district as defendant transact and have transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.											
transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set for herein.	25										
28		transacted business in this district, including activities infringing on KLEIN's patent as set forth herein.									
INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT	28	INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT									

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	ĺ	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	-	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	1	1

3. Because this case is an Intellectual Property Action, it is not subject to assignment to a particular location or division of the Court under Local Rule 3-2(c).

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 4. This is an action brought against defendant for their infringement of the United States Design Patent No. D 769,060 S (the '060 patent), generally an ornamental design for vegetable fermenting kitchenware.
 - 5. On Oct 18, 2015, said patent was duly and legally issued to plaintiff.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. THE ASSERTED '060 patent

6. At all times relevant, KLEIN is and was the owner of the '060 patent and has and had the rights thereunder. Plaintiff's patent was well known to defendant at all times relevant hereto.

II. <u>DEFENDANT'S INFRINGEMENT OF THE '060 PATENT</u>

A. THE DEFENDANT'S ACCUSED PRODUCTS

7. Commencing within the three years, for purposes of sale, defendant has exposed, marketed, made, used, offered to sell, sold, and/or imported into the United States kitchenware incorporating plaintiff's patented design as taught by the '060 patent. The model name/numbers of the defendant's kitchen include, without limitation, the Kraut Source.

B. <u>DEFENDANT'S DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE '060 PATENT</u>

8. Commencing within the last years, defendant directly has infringed, and continue to infringe the '060 patent because it, for purposes of sale, has exposed, used, demonstrated, manufactured, imported, promoted, marketed, offered for sale, and sold the defendant's Kraut Source kitchenware which incorporates KLEIN's patented design. In order to have done the forgoing, the defendant's kitchenware utilized plaintiff's '060 patent.

C. <u>DEFENDANT'S INDUCED INFRINGEMENT OF THE '060 PATENT</u>

- 9. Commencing within the last two year, defendant is liable for indirect infringement under 35 U.S.C. §271(b) because it has knowingly induced and continues to induce the direct infringement the '060 patent by third parties.
- 10. Commencing within the last two years, third parties have directly infringed the '060 patent by , for purposes of sale, exposing, buying , marketing, offering for sale and selling the defendants' infringing kitchenware.
- 11. During said time period, defendant knowingly took active steps to induce third parties in the United States to engage in direct infringement of the Claims of the '060 patent. For example, Defendant provided, sold, or promoted the defendant's infringing kitchenware to third party retailers, for purposes of said third parties to offer for sale and sell and knowing they would resell, said kitchenware which actively induced said third parties to directly infringe the '060 patent.
- 12. During said time period, defendant possessed the specific intent to induce infringement of the Claims of the '060 patent by third parties which intent was manifested, inter alia, by their selling to retailers for purposes of resale defendant's infringing kitchenware.
- 13. During said time period, defendant had knowledge of the '060 patent and knowledge that the sale and the resale by third parties of the defendant's kitchenware infringed the '060 patent. During said time period, defendant knew that its actions would and did induce infringement of the '060 patent by third parties. Defendant had actual knowledge of the '060 patent inter alia due to its knowledge of and association with plaintiff.
- 14. During said time period, defendant knew that exposing, demonstrating, marketing, making, using, offering to sell, selling, and/or importing into the United States the defendant's kitchenware constituted infringement of the '060 patent, based on, among other things, the reasons alleged in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 15. During said time period, defendant has knowingly taken active steps to induce third parties to engage in direct infringement of the '060 patent and has done so with an affirmative intent to cause such direct infringement and/or with purposeful, culpable action and conduct to encourage such direct infringement. Defendant's specific intent to induce

1	infringement is evidenced by, among other things, defendant actively selling said infringing							
2	kitchenware to third party retailers for the express purpose of resale knowing that defendants'							
3	acts would induce the third party retailers to offer for sale and to sell defendants' infringing							
4	kitchenware and by so doing to directly infringe the '060 patent.							
5	16. As a result of defendant's infringement of plaintiff's '060 patent, plaintiff has been							
6	damaged in an amount according to proof and because defendant's infringement of the '060							
7	patent was and continues to be wilful and deliberate and without a reasonable basis for believing							
8	that its conduct was or is lawful, plaintiff is entitled to treble damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and							
9	to attorney's fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.							
10	WHEREFORE plaintiff prays judgment as follows:							
11	1. That defendant render an accounting for all profits defendant received by							
12	infringing said patent;							
13	2. For damages against defendant sufficient to compensate plaintiff in an amount							
14	according to proof, but in excess of \$250,000;							
15	3. For treble damages;							
16	4. For costs and reasonable attorney fees of the subject litigation and interest as							
17	allowable by law; and							
18	5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper, including							
19	injunctive relief.							
20	DATED: August 30, 2017							
21	/s/ Frear Stephen Schmid							
22	Frear Stephen Schmid, Attorney for Plaintiff,							
23	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL							
24	Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial.							
25								
26	DATED: August 30, 2017							
27	/s/ Frear Stephen Schmid Frear Stephen Schmid, Attorney for Plaintiff							
28	SECURITY PEOPLE, INC.							
1	·							

JS-CAND 44 (Rev. 06/17)

The JS-CAND 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-CAND 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Eric A. Klein	V. 1980(2) 1 1 1 1	· · · · · ·	DEFENDANTS Cultured Gourmet, LLC				
(b) County of Residence of (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAIN) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name)	of First Listed Plaintiff (THF CASES) Address, and Telephone Number,)		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant San Francisco (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURIS	SDICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	ш. сп	IZENSHIP OF PRINC	IPAL PARTIES (Place an	"V" in One Box for Plaintiff	
	·	22	(For	Diversity Cases Only) PTF	and One i	Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
1 U.S. Government Plaintif	Federal Question (U.S. Government No.	ot a Party)	Citizer	n of This State	1 Incorporated or Prin	icipal Place 4 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)				or of Another State 2 or Subject of a 3	2 Incorporated and Prof Business in Another Springer Spri	incipal Place 5 5	
	VVIII 42 mm/.			n Country	(iii) J Torego Hautin	30. 0 339 0	
	UIT (Place an "X" in One Box						
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment Of Veteran's Benefits 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury-Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities— Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities—Other 448 Education	PERSONAL 1 365 Personal Inju	NJURY ry — Product eat Personal et Linbility sonal Injury ility OPERTY ling al Property mage Product TTIONS re acute Other	FORFEITURE/PENALTY 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC § 881 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application Actions	### BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC § 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC § 157 ### PROPERTY RIGHTS ### 835 Patent—Abbreviated New Drug Application ### 840 Trademark ### SOCIAL SECURITY #### 861 HIA (1395ff) ### 862 Black Lung (923) ### 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ### 864 SSID Title XVI ### 865 RS1 (405(g)) ### FEDERAL TAX SUITS ### 870 Tuxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ### 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC § 7609	375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC § 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
V. ORIGIN (Place an X 1 Original Proceeding 2	Removed from 3 I	Remanded from	4 Reinst Reope			8 Multidistrict sfer Litigation-Direct File	
ACTION 35 Brie	e the U.S. Civil Statute under USC 284 of descrintion of cause: mplaint for design patent		g (Do not ci	ie jurisdictional statutes unless di	versity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CARACTER CALL CONTRACT OF THE PROPERTY	CLASS ACTION	DEM.	AND \$ 250,000.00	CHECK YES only if dem JURY DEMAND:	nanded in complaint;	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY (See instru				DOCKET NUMBER			
IX. DIVISIONAL AS	SSIGNMENT (Civil L aly) × SAN FRA	ocal Rule 3-2) NCISCO/OAI	KLAND	SAN JOSI	E EUREKA-	-MCKINLEYVILLE	
DATE 08/30/2017	SICNATI	URE OF ATTO)RNEV (OF RECORD	1 A 1		